

## Contributions

### THE LORD'S SUPPER. No. 2

G. W. RENCH

What is the Lord's Supper?

By whom and when was it instituted?

Was it to be perpetuated in the church? If so, when to be observed?

Was the last supper of our Lord the Jews' Passover?

What was it to teach?

I hope to be able to answer these questions, at least satisfactorily to myself. I do not expect to satisfy all, because many writers blessed with more wisdom than myself, have gone over the same ground and have failed to meet the expectations of many. We ought, at least, to be anxious to know what Paul means when he uses the term, Lord's Supper. We see the term in print in the literature of every church. We hear it spoken from the pulpit. Do all have in mind the same thing when they use it?

Is it possible for God's chosen writers, whose mission it was to guide weak and fallible men to Jesus, to cover up their meaning so that His honest, humble followers could not determine what it was? As inspired men how could they? Catholics hold that the Bible is not for the great masses—that they can not understand it. Protestants deny the assertion; but it would seem that by their confused ideas and their mystified teachings that they are doing more to convince the world that the Catholics are right than could possibly be done in any other way. And all this confusion is going on in spite of the circulation of thousands of Bibles every year, in spite of a better qualified ministry so far as scholarship is concerned, and in spite of the increased number of commentaries. Dr. Adam Clark points out *truth* in his commentary but his people go right on following their *creed*. Read Fausset and Brown on the meaning of baptism in the light of apostolic practice and tho they declare it was immersion, their people go right on sprinkling because of its convenience. Creed before truth again. Read Robinson and Farrar on the "Lord's Supper" and "Passover." But their declarations avail nothing with their people. In practice they prefer fiction to truth.

It is not light that some people need half so much as honesty. God's people never have done nearly so well as they knew. The best revival for this age is a revival of common honesty—and in the pulpit, too. As long as creed is more to be desired than Priest and King, people go on building Towers of Babel, and of about as much consequence.

What shall be our source of appeal on this question? Since it is a Bible theme and since the Bible is adapted to the needs of every people in every clime,

we shall go there. In I Cor. 11:20 Paul says, "When therefore ye assemble yourselves together it is not possible to eat the Lord's Supper." Now, what does Paul mean by "Lord's Supper?" Evidently, from this sentence, it was something they were to eat. Take this one statement alone and it is next to impossible to miss its meaning; and yet speculation and sophistry and mysticism have been heaped upon it until, to many, it means nothing. If there is such a thing as the Lord's Supper, it certainly is something not to put on, *nor to drink but to eat*. All will concede that it is not an article of food that was called by that name, so it must be the name of a meal.

The name of the meal, however, means nothing to many people. It does not suggest one thing to them. Indeed, it would seem far from what you see among Christians that Paul had spoken of a Lord's dinner. They would then be right in the time if he had. Dr. Seiss says in arguing against immersion that Baptists do not argue fairly when they insist on immersion because "*baptisma*" means that, for they throw away the meaning of "supper" when they come to the Lord's Supper and reduce it to a crumb of bread and a sip of wine. He thinks if they stand up for the meaning of one word that they ought to do as much for another. Is he not right? How happy we ought to be in accepting alike the meaning of both words.

But let us examine some more expressions used in this same chapter. In verse 21 we have "for in your eating each one taketh before other his own supper, and one is hungry and another is drunken." Paul in showing to the disorderly Corinthians why it was "not possible to eat the Lord's Supper" uses the terms "your eating;" "his own supper;" "one is hungry;" "in like manner also the cup, after supper;" "when ye come together to eat, wait one for the other;" "if any man is hungry, let him eat at home." Now, going back to the night referred to by Paul, when our Lord instituted this supper we have such expressions as these: Matt. 26:20, "Now when even was come, he was sitting at meat;" verse 21, "As they were eating;" Mark 14:18, "as they sat and were eating;" "he that eateth with me;" verse 22, "as they were eating, he took bread, and when he had blessed, he brake it;" John 13:2, "during supper."

Now stop and ponder these expressions. When Paul speaks about "your eating," and speaks of those who had been barred from eating as being left *hungry*; when Matthew speaks about Jesus at this last supper "sitting at meat;" when Mark quotes Jesus as saying "even he that eateth with me;" when John uses the phrase, "during supper;" with all these facts standing out boldly, giving knowledge and light to all who read,

how can we say that the Word is not clear as to whether the Lord's Supper is a full meal or not? It actually would seem that special precautions have been taken to show us that "supper" means a meal, eaten in the evening of the day.

"But," says one, "Paul has done away with this eating in the church." Well, we shall see.

### FOLLOW ME

LUCY GILLASPIE

Years ago on the beautiful shore of Galilee Jesus Christ spake those words which have come down the ages to all men and will continue as time shall last.

Many many years ago this world was steeped in sin and darkness. There was no light for men to follow but a light had been promised and about eighteen hundred and ninety-eight years ago this promise was fulfilled. The angel Gabriel left the shining courts of heaven, sped his vast silvery wings and leaves behind him the Golden City, the New Jerusalem down thro the air he sped and at last lowers himself over the humble town of Nazareth.

He seeks at once the presence of the Virgin Mary and tells her that she is to be the mother of Christ before whom "every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that he is God."

O! what holy emotions must have filled the heart of Mary to know the "World's Redeemer" would be a light for all the world to follow.

In Bethlehem of Judea Christ was born. Then it was that a light shone forth into the world which will shine as long as time shall last and will continue throughout eternity.

And did people begin to follow this light at once? Most assuredly they did for at the time of the Saviour's birth a band of angels appeared to some shepherds on the hills of Judea and told them that a Savior was born and immediately they began to follow him.

Wise men came from the east to worship him and lay their gifts at his feet. Christ lived here on earth about thirty-two years. At the expiration of that time he had fully completed the example he wished to have us follow. In everything Christ gave us an example for us to follow. He entered the homes of the poor and lowly and those who have the spirit of Christ must and will do likewise. He forgave his enemies as an example that malice has no place in a Christian's heart. He did not pass heedlessly by the blind man, neither did he cast off the poor woman who was in the power of Satan.

The deepest sympathy that ever throbbed was in the bosom of Christ. He was so humble that he washed his apostle's feet as an example that his followers must be humble on earth if they wish to be exalted in heaven. And at last he enter-